

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7
8
9

10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11

NORMAN FRANK WILLOVER,

No. C 04-01240 WHA

12

Petitioner,

13

v.
A.K. SCRIBNER, Warden, California State
Prison, Corcoran,

**ORDER BARRING
PETITIONER'S COUNSEL FROM
REPRESENTING PETITIONER
IN THE INSTANT ACTION**

14

Respondent.

15

16 Counsel Frank George Prantil is **ORDERED** to cease representing petitioner Norman
17 Frank Willover in the instant action.

18

On March 5, 2006, the State Bar of California placed Mr. Prantil on inactive status as a
result of a State Bar Court finding in a disciplinary case against him. On May 23, 2006, Judge
Vaughn R. Walker issued an order to show cause why Mr. Prantil should not be removed from
the roll of attorneys authorized to practice law before the United State District Court for the
Northern District of California. After considering Mr. Prantil's answer, Judge Walker on July
6, 2006, denied Mr. Prantil's request to be allowed to continue to practice law before the court.

19

Since becoming ineligible to practice law, Mr. Prantil has continued to file documents in
the instant action. He filed a status report on March 27, 2006. After he missed a deadline to file
a traverse, a courtesy call was placed by a member of the undersigned's staff to notify Mr.
Prantil of this failure. Mr. Prantil did not take that opportunity to notify the Court of his
ineligibility to represent petitioner. Mr. Prantil then moved for an extension of time, which was

1 granted in part. Petitioner's traverse is now due July 12, 2006, a deadline which is now
2 **VACATED.**

3 Mr. Prantil is not authorized to practice law in this district court. He therefore is
4 **ORDERED OFF THE INSTANT CASE.** Mr. Prantil must **PROVIDE PETITIONER** with a copy of
5 this order and provide him **ASSISTANCE IN FINDING A NEW ATTORNEY**, if that is what
6 petitioner desires. In addition, the Court expects Mr. Prantil to **RETURN TO THEIR SOURCE**
7 **ANY FUNDS** given to him for work done in this action since March 5, 2006. Petitioner is
8 **GRANTED SIXTY DAYS FROM SERVICE OF THIS ORDER TO OBTAIN NEW COUNSEL**, if that
9 what he wants. If he does not obtain counsel, he must represent himself. After the sixty-day
10 period, the new attorney for petitioner must file, within seventy days of service of this order on
11 petitioner, a proposed schedule for filing the traverse, or a statement that no traverse will be
12 filed. If petitioner does not obtain counsel, any traverse he wishes to file will be due ninety
13 days after service of this order on him. **THE CLERK IS ORDERED TO SERVE THIS ORDER ON**
14 **PETITIONER AND TO DELIVER A COPY OF IT TO THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL**
15 **COUNSEL/INTAKE; STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA; 1149 SOUTH HILL STREET; LOS ANGELES,**
16 **CALIFORNIA 90015-2299.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 || Dated: July 7, 2006

**WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**